DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 498 SP 032 807

AUTHOR Smith, Lynn C.; Pape, Sharon L.
TITLE Reflectivity through Journal Writing: Student Teachers Write about Reading Events.
PUB DATE 29 Nov 90
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (40th, Miami, FL, November 29, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Journal Writing; *Methods Courses; Preservice Teacher Education; Reading Instruction; *Student Teachers; Teacher Behavior; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Reflective Teaching

ABSTRACT

The question posed in this study was whether university reading methods courses influenced student teachers' instructional choices through a process of reflective judgment. It also examined the students' actual practices as they related to the complexity of their reflections, and whether reflective judgment could be improved by using journal writing with a specific content focus. Eleven student teachers used journal writing to describe and reflect upon their course work from a theoretical perspective and to apply that perspective to classroom experiences. The content of the journal was to relate in particular to reading events they observed or with which they had interacted in their student teaching classroom. Comparison of student teachers' teaching behaviors, as described in supervisors' field notes, and journal entries suggested a consistency between their actions and their reflective statements about instructional events. Upward movement in the levels of reflection was not manifested by students in the study. Students expressed much perturbation in journals and in interviews with the lack of consistency between what they had been taught in their reading methods course and what they saw being done in their classrooms. It is suggested that if reasoning at higher cognitive levels is the goal of a teacher education program, students need more appropriate and consistent support. Examples of journal comments and interviews are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327498

REFLECTIVITY THROUGH JOURNAL WRITING: STUDENT TEACHERS WRITE ABOUT READING EVENTS

Lynn C. Smith
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Sharon L. Pape
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Paper presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of the
National Reading Conference, Miami, Florida
November 29, 1990

SP 032 807

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L.C. Smith

S.L. Pape

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Reflectivity through journal writing:
Student teachers write about reading events

Controversy and debate surround the examination of teacher reflectivity. First, there is little agreement on the definition of the term reflectivity. Second, different epistemological traditions underlie the research on reflectivity. Third, reflectivity generally cannot be assessed directly and generalization is difficult due to the specific contextual nature of reflection. Finally, judgments about what constitutes good or bad reflection, adequate or inadequate cognition, or what is valuable or appropriate content for reflection are problematic. To date there is little evidence that a link exists between reflectivity and classroom behavior (Kagan, 1990).

The context of this study was a mid-western university's field experience center and the eleven student teachers assigned to it. Four student teachers were secondary education majors, five student teachers were elementary education majors and two student teachers were special education double majors having a single category special education major coupled with elementary education. Seven of the student teachers (all five elementary education majors and the two special education/elementary education double majors) had participated in the elementary reading methods course with the same instructor.

This mid-western university's Teacher Education Program considers teaching to be a reflective practice. Inherent in this model is the commitment that students also will master the knowledge and skills necessary to become competent teachers. Unlike traditional-craft program models, however, this inquiry-oriented approach also fosters the ability of prospective teachers to critically examine the choices they encounter and to analyze the rationales not

only for their own teaching practices but also for educational practices in general (NCATE/ISBE: Institutional Report, 1990). Shulman (1987) describes the act of reflection :

> This is what a teacher does when he or she looks back at teaching and learning that has occurred, and reconstructs, reenacts, and/or recaptures the events, the emotions, and the accomplishments. It is the set of processes through which a professional learns from experience. (p. 331)

Calderhead (1989) extends this definition of reflection to include the metacognitive processes of comparison, self-direction and evaluation.

The epistemological basis for this study defines reflectivity in terms of the Reflective Judgment Model. The coding scheme used was modeled on the coding scheme developed by Kitchener and King (1985) which suggests increasingly complex levels of cognition. For example, in the early levels, the world is viewed in absolute terms. In the middle levels, an individual is able to see different viewpoints and understands that knowledge is relative. In the later levels, knowledge is seen as contextually based. At the most complex levels, plausibility and internal consistency are recognized as appropriate criteria for evaluating knowledge. The view we hold of reflective judgment suggests increasingly complex cognition is a function of a number of variables interacting together. That is, not only increased age but experience and expertise in an area raise cognitive complexity.

In this study journal writing was chosen as a vehicle familiar to the preservice teachers for recording their thoughts about both theory and practice. Cook, Cutler, & Young (1990) have indicated that journal writing has been used similarly in a number of other university settings related to teacher education. Writing requires a complete range of cognitive skills (Burnham, 1987) encouraging the writer to move from awareness, to challenging his or

her own assumptions, toward cognitive growth. Our student teachers used their journal writing to both describe and reflect upon their course work from a theoretical perspective and to apply that theoretical perspective to those situations which engaged them in the public school arena. These students had engaged in journal writing through several courses within their teacher education program. For example, in their elementary reading methods course, seven of the participants had been expected to keep content journals related to their required readings. In early field experience coursework, all had been required to keep logs of their public school experiences, focusing upon the reading events which they had observed. The assignments in this study built on previous journal writing experiences.

With this basis in mind, we asked whether the university reading methods course influenced preservice teachers' instructional choices through a process of reflective judgment. At what level of complexity did the students consider reading events in their journals? Did the students' actual practices show a relationship to the complexity of their reflections? Could reflective judgment be improved during the student teaching semester using journal writing with a specific content focus? Finally, if reflective judgment could become more complex did that result in improved teaching?

METHODOLOGY

Data were collected from multiple sources. A primary source was student teachers' dialogue journals. Other sources included field observations and field notes of the students' teaching, reflective judgment interview scores, and transcriptions of in-depth post student teaching interviews.

Student teachers were required to keep a dialogue journal. (See Table 1 for specific student teaching assignments.) The content of the journal was to

relate in particular to reading events which the student teachers had observed or with which they had interacted in their student teaching classroom. Students were to describe the event itself, elaborate upon the classroom context, analyze the event and its effects, and reflect on the event from their own personal, practical theories (Elbaz, 1983; Pape, 1988). Practical theories represent conceptual structures that teachers use to justify their choices of action and curriculum materials (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1986).

The journals were collected weekly, read and commented upon by one or both of the researchers, then returned to the students. The nature of the comments was to encourage reflection at deeper levels by posing questions which were at least one level higher than the original entries. Copies of the journals were made and kept for analysis. The journals' contents and the researchers' comments were analyzed and coded on the basis of levels of reflection modified from work by Kitchener & King (1985) and Simmons, Moon & Niemeyer (1990).

MODIFIED LEVELS OF REFLECTION

Level 0: No references to reading events or pedagogical concepts; comments related to self, feelings, non-instructional

Level 1: Describes instructional events in a technical, mechanical way without regard to appropriate concept labels

Level 2: Describes instructional events using concept labels justified by a perspective that is authority based

Level 3: Uses personal experiences to describe instructional events; includes some concept labels but no analysis or prediction of consequences

Level 4: Uses practical, simplistic evaluative statement containing reference to an instructional concept; no justification or cause-effect statements

Level 5: Describes and evaluates instructional events; presents if-then thinking but stays in one domain

Level 6: Describes and evaluates instructional events; using if-then-because statements; may cross domains when presenting a rationale for evaluation of the event; takes a stand

Table 1

Responses to Journal Writing and Reflective Judgment Interviews

Code Name	#Journal Entries	#Pages	Average # Pages	Level	RJIS #1	RJIS #2	RJIS #3
Donna	9	1-1 1/2	1	Secondary Special Ed	NA	NA	NA
Elizabeth	11	1 - 4	4	Secondary English	5	4	5
Ginny	7	1 - 2	2	Elementary 2nd	NA	NA	NA
Helen	12	1 - 4	4	Elementary 3rd	3	3	4
Judie	9	1 - 4	2	Middle School 5th	NA	NA	NA
Marcella	23	1/2 - 2	1/2	Elementary 2nd	4	4	4
Paul	4	1/2 - 2	1	Secondary Science	NA	NA	NA
Saundra	11	1/2 - 2	1/2	Middle School Science	4	4	4
Stella	7	1/2 - 2	1	Secondary Special Ed	4	4	4
Wendy	5	2	2	Secondary Speech Drama	6	6	6
Zoe	9	1-2	2	Elementary 3rd	4	4	4

Reflective Judgment Interview Scores (RJIS)

RJIS #1: Sex education
RJIS #2: Corporal punishment
RJIS #3: Ability grouping

Level 7: Describes and evaluates instructional events using multiple perspectives; transfers instructional concepts beyond the present instructional setting; recognizes impact of specific situations and contexts on learning

Field notes of observations of the student teachers were made on a biweekly schedule throughout the semester. The same coding system of modified levels of reflection was used to analyze the field notes. In depth interviews were conducted with the students at the end of the semester to elicit their perceptions of their focused journal writing and its effect on their attention to reading events. The interviews were audio taped and transcribed.

Seven of the student teachers in this study also participated in Reflective Judgment Interviews as part of another study conducted by the researchers. Their responses to a series of bi-polar educational issues were rated by trained raters using the Reflective Judgment Rating Scale (Kitchener & King, 1985). Issues responded to included sex education, corporal punishment, and ability grouping. (See Table 1.)

RESULTS

Levels 3 and 4 represented the modal level of reflectivity for students' journal entries. As can be seen in Table 2, of the 105 entries, 35 entries were judged to be at Level 3 and 36 entries at Level 4. In entries judged to be written at Level 3 students used personal experiences as a basis to describe and justify their interpretations of instructional events. Although they used some concept labels, their writing contained no analysis or predictions of consequences related to instruction. Entries judged to be at Level 4 contained practical although simplistic evaluative statements pertaining to instructional actions, their own or other teachers'. They did not draw cause-effect

Table 2

Journal Entry Levels of Reflection

Level of Reflection	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Donna	0	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	8
Elizabeth	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	0	10
Ginny	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	7
Helen	0	0	0	0	6	4	1	0	11
Judie	0	0	0	1	7	2	0	0	10
Marcella	6	1	3	11	2	0	0	0	23
Paul	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	4
Saundra	3	2	0	4	2	0	0	0	11
Stella	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	7
Wendy	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	5
Zoe	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	9
TOTALS	11	6	3	35	36	12	2	0	105

relationships between actions and outcomes. (See examples of journal entries at specific levels of reflection in Appendix A).

Observations of teaching behaviors recorded in field notes were summarized and given a rating based on the behaviors indicated in the modified levels of reflection. (See Table 3.) A greater number of described behaviors fell within Levels 3 and 4 than in the other categories. Eleven entries, made by only three students, were judged at Level 0; those contained personal statements, complaints, and other comments unrelated to instruction. One student, Marcella, accounted for six of these entries. All three of these students had described observed behaviors falling in the Level 0 category. Although Level 0 comments often pertained to the students' social and emotional states, since these were not directed toward instruction, they were considered irrelevant to the focus of this study. It is probable that such comments could give supplemental information regarding other aspects of the student teaching experience.

Fewer journal entries were judged to be at Levels 1 or 2. Those categories represented the least reflective attitudes about instructional events. The six entries judged to be at Level 1 described instructional events in a mechanical manner without using appropriate concept labels. Three of the four students who wrote entries judged at Level 1 also exhibited Level 1 described observed behaviors.

In the three Level 2 entries instructional events were described with a concept label. Marcella accounted for all three entries at Level 2; this student based her evaluation of events on some external authority, for example, the cooperating teacher. No student, however, was judged to have exhibited Level 2 behaviors.

Table 3

Comparison of Reflective Judgment Interview Ratings and Observed Behaviors

Level of Reflection	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Donna				*	*				
Elizabeth					*	*+	*		
Ginny				*	*				
Helen				*+	*	*	*		
Judie				*	*	*			
Marcella	*	*	*	*	*+				
Paul				*	*	*			
Saundra	*				*+				
Stella	*	*		*	*+				
Wendy				*	*		+		
Zoe				*	*+				

Reflective Judgment Interview Ratings +

Levels of Observed Teaching Behavior *

Four students accounted for all the journal entries judged at Levels 5 and 6 in Table 2. Two of these students were secondary education majors and two were elementary education majors. The described observed behaviors of these same four students accounted for all the Level 5 behaviors in Table 3; two of these students accounted for the only Level 6 behaviors noted. No journal entries or behaviors were judged to be at Level 7.

Semi-structured interviews with six of the participants were conducted to determine whether a relationship existed between the forced attention to reading events via journal entries and students' perceptions of the effects on their planning and practices. (See Appendix B.) Students interviewed expressed positive attitudes toward journal writing in general, but they were not as positive about being assigned to focus on reading events. Students reported that focusing on reading events in their journals did cause them to think more about reading events during planning and teaching. As might be expected, there were considerable discrepancies between theories taught in their reading methods course and their actual experiences in the field placements. For example, Zoe was delighted when her school experienced a severe paper shortage, and the cooperating teacher turned to her for direction in planning reading activities that did not require dittos. (See Appendix C for sample interview responses.)

Most of the students attempted to write about reading events. Elementary education majors were successful at including a discussion of reading events in their journals and expressed little discomfort in writing about reading events. Secondary students were less apt to have written about reading events and felt more discomfort with the assignment of the topic. Both elementary and secondary students included other concerns, especially

management problems, in their journal entries. Paul did not write about reading events at all after his initial entry.

Differences existed among participants in the number of entries. Some students ceased to write any journal entries on any topic mid-way through the semester. Ginny withdrew from student teaching at midterm. Not all students followed the assigned format for writing about reading events.

DISCUSSION

Comparison of student teachers' described observed teaching behaviors and journal entries suggests a consistency between student teachers' actions and their reflective statements about instructional events. This consistency was maintained across levels; for example, those participants whose described observed teaching behaviors were rated at the lower levels of reflection also made journal entries at those same levels.

While elementary education and special education majors had taken course work in reading methodology, secondary education majors, representing the content areas of speech, drama, science, and English had taken no reading methodology course work. Secondary education majors expressed difficulty in conceiving what constituted a reading event, despite explicit examples presented during the orientation meeting. Further, they reported difficulty identifying any such events in their classrooms and reported being perturbed by the assignment. On the other hand, elementary education and special education majors were able to identify reading events. However, some of the elementary education students perceived reading events in a very limited frame. For example, Judie, student teaching in a departmentalized fifth grade, complained that it was difficult to write on the

assigned task because she did not "teach reading, only science, social studies and language arts."

Analysis of the content of the journal entries over time revealed less extensive entries and fewer concerns about reading events. No consistent pattern of movement among levels was noted. That is, journal entries did not become progressively more or less reflective about reading events, with one exception. Marcella's journal described a decreasing enthusiasm for teaching and, simultaneously, an increasing difficulty in meeting the expectations of her cooperating teacher. She retreated from a focus on reading events to one on personal survival. Marcella's retreat to a focus on self might be viewed in terms of the developmental stages of teaching concerns (Fuller & Brown, 1975), that is, while she struggled with personal survival she appeared unable to focus on instructional issues.

Helen was the only participant who followed the assigned format throughout the semester. She methodically produced journal entries four pages in length which described and analyzed reading events in her classroom.

Helen and Elizabeth were the only student teachers who moved to Level 6, presenting a rationale in their evaluation of events. Each of these two students produced one journal entry at Level 6. This did not represent their usual patterns. It did, however, suggest that both these students were capable of presenting if-then-because statements about reading events.

Although no consistent change was noted in the reflective levels of the students as expressed in their journals, interview data suggest that a change in attention to reading events did occur for some students. Further, reading events were more frequently considered during planning and teaching, particularly among the elementary and special education majors. The participants reported these self-perceived changes during interviews but did

not write of them in their journals. As the semester progressed students commented about the lack of time for reflecting in their journals, indeed for writing journal entries at all. Because the interviews were conducted after student teaching was completed, it is possible the students felt freer to reflect and comment on their classroom experiences.

Interview data also suggest that secondary education students resisted the assignment to write about reading events partially due to confusion or lack of knowledge or information about reading events. Secondary student teachers could not identify reading events and did not see a relationship between reading and their content areas. They were unable to identify specific reading problems or help pupils who exhibited reading problems and thought those pupils could or should be referred to someone else for help; in other words, assisting poor readers was not in their job description.

Students commented on the written replies, exhortations, and questions written in their journals by the researchers. The researchers attempted to write questions, comments and probes at one level of reflection higher than the level exhibited in the journal entry. According to Piaget's (1975) theory of development, such perturbing experiences may generate cognitive growth.

Upward movement in the levels of reflection was not manifested by students in this study. This finding is consistent with findings in other studies, e.g., Kitchener and King (1988) and Knefflekamp (1974). Knefflekamp's (1974) attempt to influence reflective judgment levels of students in a university class using Piaget's (1975) theory produced cognitive growth to the next higher levels in students who were at the lowest levels of reflective judgment. Students at higher levels showed no gains. It appears to be more difficult for change to occur at the upper levels of reflective judgment. Since the greatest number of students in this study were generally at the mid levels of reflection

with regard to both their journal entries and their described observed behaviors it is not surprising that greater upward movement was not exhibited. Additionally, reflective judgment is believed to be developmental (Kitchener & King, 1988); therefore, the one semester provided in this study may not have been enough time for change to occur.

IMPLICATIONS

Because the secondary education students have no required coursework at this university in the area of reading instruction, greater care needs to be taken in the way the journal writing assignment is presented to them. Furthermore, with the present emphasis on reading in the content areas, it seems incumbent on both state certification boards and university secondary education programs to provide for reading methods instruction. One course in secondary level reading is offered as an elective at this institution, but few undergraduate students are enrolled.

A requirement for a regularly written journal presented problems for some students. However, interview data suggest that students found the journals to be therapeutic as well as helpful for their learning, despite the lack of such evidence within the journals themselves. Requiring that the written journals focus on reading events placed the secondary students at a disadvantage. Even the elementary and special education majors, who had the benefit of a required reading methods course, found it difficult to think in complex ways about reading events, even though they were able to identify and describe such events in their classrooms. Reflections tended generally to remain at superficial levels. We would not expect students whose reflective judgment scores indicated low or moderate levels of reflective judgment to make instructional decisions at highly complex levels.

Students expressed much perturbation in journals and in interviews with the lack of consistency between what they had been taught in their reading methods course and what they saw being done in their respective classrooms regarding reading instruction. Although Kitchener and King's (1985) findings show a high positive relationship between education and reasoning, according to Piaget (1975), it is perturbations, such as the discrepancies between coursework and classroom practice, that may engender cognitive change. Low density and low frequency contradictions to an individual's existing schema are dismissed. Contradictions of a high density and high frequency may cause the individual to modify his or her schemes to account for the contradiction.

To provide preservice teachers with contradictions which are intense, this university needs to offer a practicum semester tied to the reading methods course where students can focus on the theoretical content of the course and the inherent contradictions most likely to occur in a field experience. Clearly, students cannot be just cast adrift in a sea of theoretical issues; neither can experience alone be depended upon.

In the present field experience model the resolution of the discrepancy between practices based on research which are advocated in methodology coursework and those practices encountered in the field experience classroom seems monumental to students. In many cases (e.g., Lortie, 1975) preservice students resolve such discrepancies by conforming to the practices already in place in their field experience classroooms. Budding shifts toward higher reasoning levels may be overpowered by the constraints of present classroom practices. Neither undergraduate education nor field experience alone appears to promote development to the highest levels of reflection. For these students to reason about the instructional implications of differing theoretical

positions and to be able to justify their instructional choices, appropriate sustained guidance and support throughout methodology coursework and field experiences are necessary.

If a goal of teacher education programs is to increase reasoning at higher cognitive levels, then greater opportunities need to be provided for students to experience appropriate support as they struggle toward higher levels of reasoning. Teacher educators need to emphasize collaborative efforts that place a high priority on the consistent articulation of opportunities for active integration of experiences and related theoretical issues. In other words, coursework and field experiences must be viewed as providing complementary bases for development to occur.

REFERENCES

Burnham, C. C. (1987). Reinvigorating a tradition: The personal development journal. In T. Fullan (Ed.), The Journal Book. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5 (1), 43-51.

Cook, P. F., Cutler, B. R. & Young, J. R. (1990, February). Is structured training in reflection better than journal writing in training preservice students to reflect? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas, NV.

Elbaz, F. (1983). Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. NY: Nichols Publishing Company.

Fuller, F. F. & Bown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education, the 74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kagan, D. M. (1990). Ways of evaluating teacher cognition: Inferences concerning the Goldilocks Principle. Review of Educational Research, 60 (3), 419-469.

Knefflekamp, L. L. (1974). Developmental instruction fostering intellectual and personal growth of college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Kitchener, K. S. & King, P. (1985). Reflective judgment scoring rules. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota.

Kitchener, K. S. & King, P. M. (1988). The reflective judgment model: Ten years of research. In M. L. Commons, C. Armon, L. Kohlberg, F. A. Richards, T. A. Grotzer, & J. Sinnott (Eds.), Adult development: Vol. 2. Models and methods in the study of adolescent and adult thought (pp. 63-78). New York: Praeger.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/ISBE) Institutional Report. (1990.) Institutional Standards (Vol.1) (p. 48). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, College of Education.

Pape, S. L. (1988). Student teacher thinking: The development and content of practical theories. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Piaget, J. (1975). L'equilibration des structures cognitives. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Sanders, D. & McCutcheon, G. (1986). The development of practical theories of teaching. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2 (1), 50-67.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 313-334.

Simmons, J. M., Moon, R. A. & Niemeyer, R. C. (1990, February). Re-designing the instructional evaluative components of student teaching: Implications of the research on supervisor and teacher cognition. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas, NV.

APPENDIX A

Examples of Levels from journals. Names have been changed to preserve anonymity. Selections are quoted exactly from journals. No changes have been made in grammar, punctuation or spelling.

Level 0:

Happy birthday me! I am 24 years old today! I finished my lesson plans. I hope they are ok because they are sloppy. Tomorrow is Monday. I wish it wasn't. I still feel a little uncomfortable in the classroom. I just have to remember other student teachers have gone through the same thing. Even though I think I am a horrible teacher, there must be people worse than I am. (Stella)

Level 1:

This is the first class I am in complete charge of. I assigned the "Words to Use" at the end of chapter #15. Students are working extremely quietly. I am surprised. Most of the students finished the assignment before the end of the hour. Also assign 15.1 and 15.2 in the text to read. (Saundra)

Level 2:

The teacher had the children read the story silently, first. The teacher led the children in a discussion about the pictures. She asked such things like, "What are they doing and where do you think their [sic] going." After these questions, they went around the table reading out loud. At the end of reading the teacher asked comprehension questions about the story. The teacher usually sat with the children, but at times she got up and walked around the table. The one thing I would do differently is to "activate prior knowledge." They talk about vocabulary words. I would do more than vocabulary. Mrs. K does activate prior knowledge when she is with the entire class. I did notice that in math Mrs. K does bring up jargon of print. For example she says, "Remember when we read, we read from left to right."....One thing I don't know how I feel about worksheets. Mrs. K uses a lot of them, but she uses them <u>well</u>. (Marcella)

Level 3:

I've noticed that many of the students that come to me saying they don't understand want me to help them do it [their worksheets]. I need to be firmer about that too. I don't help them except to ask them to read the directions and to explain them to me. I really feel that most of these worksheets are useless. Context clues can be learned through reading books. (Ginny)

Level 4:

This past week we did informative speeches in oral communication. I spent one whole day discussing the outline. I stressed thoroughness! I gave them specific examples and offered to help them as they went along, but still, I got the sketchiest outlines I have ever seen. Some of them didn't even have Roman numerals!! I gave them back and gave them further instruction. They had the option of turning them back in today or taking the grade they got. Only five people re-turned theirs in. I've come to the conclusion that they have weak outlining skills and/or many are truly satisfied to just pass. (Wendy)

Level 5:

The students in social studies did much better on their tests this time.... I'm not sure if the difference is because they knew the kind of test I would give or if they knew that they would be as difficult as Mrs. I gives. I think one difference is that I didn't use as many fill in the blank questions. ... I think they do better without a list. I think this because it seems like they have to think more about information given in a sentence than about all those words to choose from. (Judie)

Level 6:

The teacher rushed through this story much more quickly than others. I realized that one can't spend two weeks on a story as she did on the previous one. This week seemed to be a little disorganized though, and not as well planned as in the past. Maybe the previous week of vacation made it hard to get back in the swing. (Helen)

Level 7:

I'm wondering about this requiring students to pronounce words before the class for a grade. I can see good points and bad points. Good points may be: it forces the children to take the pronunciation seriously. It lets the listeners experience a lot of practice while others are reciting. It gives them practice in talking before a group. And maybe after doing this a lot they are more relaxed reciting. Bad points include: Students may be nervous and not able to perform as well as they really can. Students who pronounce their words last have a definite advantage having heard the words pronounced twenty to thirty times; they get better grades. Students who are not reciting tune out the process and time on task along with valuable teaching time is lost while using so much time for testing. I'm still not sure whether the good outweighs the bad or the bad outweighs the good. I'm sure the teacher sees it as a teaching activity as well as an evaluation technique. She uses this individual style or approach often and in other subjects. She always does it orally and before the group. I feel slow learners are embarrassed and made

nervous by this technique. I wonder if she uses this every year or if it seems to work well with this particular class. I'll ask! (Helen)

APPENDIX B
JOURNAL PROJECT INTERVIEW

1. Would you please comment on the process of writing a journal?
   (probes) What were your perceptions of journal writing?
   What were your perceptions about writing in a journal as an assignment?
   Did you write in your journal regularly?
   Are/were you a habitual journal writer?

2. Was it difficult to write a journal?
   (probe for why, how, under what conditions?)

3. What was your understanding of the task you were given?
   (probes) Did you know what reading events were? (if no, ask if they tried to clarify, what happened?)
   When did you come to an understanding of the assignment? How did that occur?
   What could have been said or done by the instructor to make this assignment more clear? More useful to you?

4. Did writing in your journal have any effect on the attention you gave to reading events?
   (probes should elicit how, why, under what conditions, what examples can participant offer to support the claim?) Try to get beyond "I liked it, or didn't like it".

5. When you planned a lesson what things did you consider?
   (probes) Did your journal help you in any way? (how, when, under what circumstances?)
   Did you find yourself attending to reading in more than "reading class?" (ask for elaboration)

6. Did your classroom experiences change or modify the understandings you had about reading?
   (probes) Elicit: what understandings were,
   how they changed,
   where they were acquired
   what caused the change
   whether journal had any impact on this change?

7. Did you find constraints in applying the theory you learned on campus to your teaching experience?
   (probes) What were the constraints?
   Who created them?
   Did your journal help you in any way to deal with them?

8. Was there consistency between what you learned in your university course work and what happened in the field experience?
   (probes) Could you explain that a little more?
   How was it different/alike?
   Were some courses better than others? Why? How?
   What did you do about it?
   What are you feelings about it now?
   What recommendations do you have for university instructors who teach the theory courses?

9. If you had a second opportunity to student teacher, what would you do differently? The same? Why?

10. If you could advise us on how to make this assignment for journal writing more meaningful for student teachers what would you suggest?

    (probes) What was good about it?
    What do you wish it had included or excluded?

APPENDIX C
Interviews

What were the students' perceptions of journal writing in general?

Stella: I really thought it was a good idea. It gave me something tangible. It was a boost to my ego because I'm not a very god writer. It made me look back.

Marcella: I liked it. More than one person was responding to what I did. That helped me to know which way I should go and what I should do differently. In general my perceptions of the journal writing were fairly positive.

Wendy: I enjoyed it because it got me thinking. I had to think in order to put it down on paper. It got me to reflect a lot more on what had happened. Through the journals when I was reflecting I thought about things I hadn't thought of before. So it was really a reflective process.

Elizabeth: I love journal writing. I think that its a great thing. I wrote about things that happened that I didn't want to forget. Mostly like instances of any kind of difficulty that I wanted to write about that I thought might help me out. I think they were things that I wanted to know how to deal with.

Zoe: Before I started doing it I thought it was going to be just a hassle, but then as it went along it gave me time to sit down and get my thoughts together. Normally I wouldn't take the time to sit down and think about these things. This forced me to sit and think, to go over what I had been doing and write about different situations. As it went on, I really liked it. I think it got better as I went along . I kept thinking of different things toward the end, that was like I had a lot of things I couldn't decide which treasure I wanted to write about. I got the hang of it more as it went along.

Students were asked if writing in their journals had any effect on the attention they gave to reading events.

Judie: If I were in the back of the class observing then I could say I think that this is what the kids should be doing. But If I'm in front of the class, I don't do it like that, I just call on the kids and do it.

Stella: There was a connection between the journal writing and my attention to reading, but I would have attended to it anyway because I think reading is so inclusive of everything else. I think you have to make extra effort to teach reading all the time. The journal helped me to support where I was at, and to make sure I had some kind of clear understanding where I was at.

Marcella: Yeah. At the first. Once you did it on the first day or the first week, it was the same old reading stuff everyday. That's just the way the

teacher did reading. It was the same routine. So once you did a few journals on it, you couldn't write anything different about it. I thought it drew our attention to it than to any other subject. But then, reading is one of the more important subjects.

Wendy: I didn't have the language to talk about reading events. I had some kind of instinct about it from my speech classes and critiquing and judging contests and stuff. I knew what I wanted to say to them [about reading instruction] in that respect.

Did journal writing help focus attention on reading during planning?

Judie: Well sometimes if I wanted to find out what someone was learning, and it was not in my plans, I would call on different people to read and ask them questions and stuff.

Marcella: The journal helped me afterward because I wrote about the lesson. If something went wrong my supervisor might have commented on it and that helped. I could see why it went wrong.

Wendy: When I started teaching my English classes, I noticed that the kids needed practice in reading out loud. It seemed that they improved as the read out loud, so I tried to plan at least once or twice a week for them to have a chance to read out loud. I tried to help them work on comprehension. Comprehension is basically what we worked on the most I think. Going back and saying, "Now do you see this?" and "What do you get from this?"

Zoe: I think so. it became more like you're critiquing yourself. ....Thinking about all the different things you can do and the different things you can change.. I was thinking my cooperating teacher could have done this, and I'm not planning for it and I can do it too. So, I think you become more aware of where you're not doing reading. It was a problem for me was trying to be creative [teaching reading without dittos] and yet getting it done in the time slot you have.

Did classroom experiences modify or change perceptions about reading?

Stella: I think I saw more more aspects of reading effects like that (i.e., note writing between student and teacher) than I think I would have.

Marcella: Yeah, but I think that was due to the teacher I had. Her style of reading, the way she taught it. Just the fact that a one-on-one situation or a one-on-six situation is so much better than a one-on-twenty situation.

Wendy: Yeah I think I did. Basically what I noticed the most, if you corrected students during their reading, and you said, would you please speak up, enunciate a little bit more, ...most of them for the most part do it. I learned how to monitor them. It used to be that the people who read very slowly and choppily in class drove me crazy. It grated on my nerves.

But when it became a task that I had to look for and realize, I had an easier time helping them out.

Zoe: I think it is so easy to include reading in different content areas but before [this experience] I was just thinking of teaching each different [content area] class. Instead of trying to bring different things into it as far as reading. I think there is a lot of opportunity to do that but you don't take time that you could. As far as grouping, I think my mind has changed so many times. I feel like using the textbook if something in it is useful for what we're talking about and getting books - good books - for the class to read and have activities in and go from there, just using books off the bookshelves.

Did you find consistency between university course work and what happened in the field?

Stella: I think the theoretical part should be done at the same time as actual teaching. A lot of people don't connect what they had in class to what happens in teaching. They go with what their teachers feel. I think you should shorten the student teaching time and have some reading classes. I think the methods classes were an idealistic view of what was going to work in a classroom....Ideas were good and it was good to have them.

Marcella: A lot of the things we learned might not apply to that grade level. For example, a lot of the things we learned were for upper elementary and it was hard to apply them to lower elementary. I felt constraints within me, not from the situation, but within me. I was worried about trying something new and different not knowing whether it was going to work. The journal helps cause I can write down something and maybe work at it if I can talk myself through it. Writing it down...helps come up better with a solution than if you were just thinking about it...because you got visual and mental too. One thing that was inconsistent, [at the university] they teach LEAs and out there they're not adjusted to LEAs yet. They're scared of them, and not a lot of teachers use them.

Zoe: Its not what you learned that was happening, it could have but it is not what was happening in the field. You couldn't go in and change everything over night. But I think slowly you could start to change things. It's hard to get them [the pupils] to focus on something other than what they've been used to [referring to her attempts to change the reading routines].

What recommendations do you have for the teacher preparation program?

Stella: I think I would probably have some methods classes along with the practical experience. You don't see the real picture when you're just

sitting in the university class. I think its just not practical enough. But when you get into a classroom like in student teaching, you're just so overwhelmed that right there and then you can't call that stuff up.

Wendy: I think it would be helpful [for secondary teachers to have some sort of training in reading]. If everybody did have just a little bit of background, then if they ran into difficulty they'd probably be able to handle it. If it was really bad, they could get more professional help.

Zoe: I think there should be less electives for student teachers. I think they should be able to student teach for a year instead of a semester, because I learned so much from it and it made me more comfortable teaching. You need that guidance form another teacher even maybe if its not the perfect role model, so you can learn to do simple things like take lunch count. I loved the theory classes. They give you good ideas for going out there and teaching. I would get rid of some of the classes that weren't theory like the testing class. I liked the theory classes so much more because it gives you an idea of what's going on and how you are going to do something.

Were the comments written back to you on your journal helpful?

Zoe: I think so. A lot of the comments you gave us focused on what to look for, like the follow-up. And like different behaviors to observe. To examine yourself... You made us self-evaluate.

In what ways might the journal writing assignment be made more meaningful?

Stella: I think everybody should have had one thing from their journals to share at seminars. More time for sharing in seminars would probably get me more involved. I'd write more. I think I would answer the feed back questions [you wrote]. I'm not very happy with my [journal entries] now because they're kind of sloppy.

Wendy: I'd like to have other people perform [talk at seminars]. I think people will get out of it [journal writing] what they want to. I got a lot out of it for me.

Zoe: I think it puts a constraint on some people to have to write about just one topic.

Marcella: One thing that might help would be suggestions to consider. Not a list of things to dwell on but maybe some things to reflect on regarding reading events.